arXiv:1201.1605v2 [math.NT] 11 Sep 2012

CRITICAL ORBITS AND ATTRACTING CYCLES IN p-ADIC DYNAMICS

ROBERT BENEDETTO, PATRICK INGRAM, RAFE JONES, AND ALON LEVY

ABSTRACT. A rational function $\varphi(z)$ of degree $d \geq 2$ with coefficients in an algebraically closed field is post-critically finite (PCF) if all of its critical points have finite forward orbit under iteration. We show that the collection of PCF rational functions is a set of bounded height in the moduli space of rational functions over the complex numbers, once the well-understood family known as flexible Lattès maps is excluded. As a consequence, there are only finitely many conjugacy classes of non-Lattès PCF rational maps of a given degree defined over any given number field. The key ingredient of the proof is a non-archimedean version of Fatou's classical result that every attracting cycle of a rational function over $\mathbb{C}$ attracts a critical point.

1. INTRODUCTION

A rational function $\varphi \in \mathbb{C}(z)$ is *post-critically finite* (PCF) if all of its critical points in $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ have finite forward orbits under iteration of φ. Over $\mathbb{C}$, where the orbits of the critical points are known to play a central role in the global dynamics of a map, it is not surprising that PCF maps exhibit interesting behavior. Since Thurston's foundational result on PCF maps [15], a growing body of work has focused on their properties [8, 11, 12, 13, 26, 31, 40]. In this article, we study PCF maps from an arithmetic point of view, where their novel properties are only beginning to be explored.

Our interest here lies in the distribution of PCF maps in the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_d$ of rational functions of degree $d \geq 2$ up to change of variables; see Section 2 for more precise definitions. Thurston's result implies that apart from a well-understood class of PCF maps associated to elliptic curves, known as the flexible Lattès maps, there are only finitely many conjugacy classes of rational maps defined over $\mathbb{C}$ whose critical points each have orbits of length not exceeding N, for any given integer N. Moreover, all such maps are $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$-rational points in the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_d$. Hence, the PCF points in $\mathcal{M}_d$ consist of the Lattès locus plus a countable set, and they are therefore in a precise sense a sparse subset of $\mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{C})$. However, this fact does not *a priori* preclude the possibility that many, or even most, points in $\mathcal{M}_d(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})$ give conjugacy classes of PCF maps. Our main result shows this is not the case, by bounding the height (see

---

Date: September 13, 2012.

Definition 2.4) of PCF points. In particular, the height referred to in the following result is the pullback of the usual Weil height on projective space via a morphism which is finite away from the Lattès maps, and hence shares the usual properties of the Weil height.

Theorem 1.1. *For each $d \geq 2$, the PCF locus in $\mathcal{M}_d(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})$ consists of the flexible Lattès locus, plus a set of bounded height. In particular, for any fixed integer $B \geq 1$, there are, up to change of variables, only finitely many PCF rational functions of degree d that are not flexible Lattès maps but that may be defined over a number field of degree at most B.*

From a number-theoretic perspective, one of the motivations for studying PCF points in $\mathcal{M}_d$ is an analogy with CM points in the moduli space of elliptic curves. If φ is defined over a number field L, one may associate to φ an *arboreal Galois representation* via the natural action of $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{L}/L)$ on the infinite tree of all preimages, under the iterates of φ, of a fixed L-rational point. The image of this representation is much smaller for PCF maps than for typical rational functions [1, 10]. By comparison, the ℓ-adic Galois representations of elliptic curves with complex multiplication have much smaller images than those attached to elliptic curves without CM.

The second claim in Theorem 1.1 is very similar to a statement for j-invariants of CM elliptic curves, which follows from class field theory and the Gauss Conjecture, originally proven by Heilbronn. In the case of polynomials, the second author [28] has already established Theorem 1.1, which follows from stronger results relating the height of the coefficients of a polynomial to the rate of growth of the heights in its critical orbits, but the arguments in [28] seem unlikely to generalize to rational functions. The proof of Theorem 1.1 follows a fundamentally different approach, which comes from studying the height of the multipliers of periodic cycles.

Let K be a field, let $\varphi \in K(z)$ be a rational function, and let $\gamma \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$. If $\varphi(\gamma) = \gamma$, we say γ is a *fixed point* of φ. In that case, by a change of coordinates, we may assume that $\gamma \neq \infty$, and define the *multiplier* of γ to be $\lambda = \varphi'(\gamma) \in K$. More generally, if $\varphi^n(\gamma) = \gamma$ for some $n \geq 1$, where φ^n denotes the n-fold composition $\varphi \circ \cdots \circ \varphi$, then we say γ is a *periodic point* of φ of period n; and if n is the minimal period of γ, then we define the *multiplier* of γ to be $\lambda = (\varphi^n)'(\gamma) \in K$. The multiplier is invariant under coordinate change, and it is the same for each point $\varphi^k(\gamma)$ in the forward orbit, or periodic cycle, of the periodic point γ. If K is equipped with an absolute value $|\cdot|$, we say that the orbit of the periodic point γ is *attracting* if $0 \leq |\lambda| < 1$; the case $\lambda = 0$ is referred as the *superattracting* case. We say that γ *attracts* $x \in K$ if $\lim_{m\to\infty} \varphi^{nm}(x) = \varphi^k(\gamma)$ for some $0 \leq k \leq n-1$, and that γ *strictly attracts* $x \in K$ if γ attracts x, but $\varphi^n(x) \neq \gamma$ for all $n \geq 1$.

The main engine in our proof of Theorem 1.1 is the following result.

Theorem 1.2. *Let K be an algebraically closed field which is complete with respect to a non-archimedean absolute value $|\cdot|$. Let $p \geq 0$ be the residue characteristic of K, let $d \geq 2$ be an integer, and assume either that* $\operatorname{char} K = 0$ *or that* $\operatorname{char} K > d$. *Define the real number $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_{p,d} \leq 1$ to be*

$$\varepsilon = \min\{|m|^d : 1 \leq m \leq d\},$$

which is clearly positive. Let $\varphi(z) \in K(z)$ be a rational function of degree d, and let γ be a fixed point of φ satisfying

$$0 < |\varphi'(\gamma)| < \varepsilon.$$

Then there is a critical point of φ which is strictly attracted to γ.

Note that if $p = 0$ or $p > d$, then the definition above gives $\varepsilon_{p,d} = 1$. In addition, we will see in Theorem 5.1 that if $\varphi(z) \in K[z]$ is a polynomial, then the constant ε in Theorem 1.2 can be improved to $\varepsilon_{p,d}^{\text{poly}} = \min\{|m|^m : 1 \leq m \leq d\}$, which is sharp in that case. For general rational functions, however, we will see in Section 5 that the bound $\varepsilon_{p,d}$ is not sharp.

It is a classical result from complex dynamics that over $\mathbb{C}$, every attracting cycle strictly attracts a critical point [4, Theorem 9.3.1]. The proof uses complex analysis in a fundamental way. The analogous statement over a non-archimedean field of positive residue characteristic, however, is false; for instance, the map $\varphi(z) = z^p$, defined over the completion $\mathbb{C}_p$ of the algebraic closure of $\mathbb{Q}_p$, has the curious property that every cycle is attracting, with respect to the natural extension of the p-adic absolute value. Thus, although the full strength of the classical complex result does not carry over to non-archimedean fields, Theorem 1.2 says that in the non-archimedean case, a non-superattracting cycle strictly attracts a critical point provided that the cycle is *sufficiently* attracting.

We will deduce Theorem 1.1 from Theorem 1.2 in Section 2, but we briefly sketch the idea here. By definition, a PCF map defined over a number field L cannot have a critical point strictly attracted to a periodic point over *any* completion L_v, as v varies over the places of L. Thus if φ is a PCF map defined over L, then Theorem 1.2 provides an upper bound on the v-adic absolute value of the reciprocal of the multiplier of any cycle of length n, for such a cycle consists of fixed points of φ^n. The local bounds induce a bound on the height of any such multiplier. By a basic property of the Weil height (see Definition 2.4), it follows that there are only finitely many values in L that such a multiplier could take. Finally, a celebrated theorem of McMullen [33] states that for N chosen large enough relative to d, the multipliers of all n-cycles with $1 \leq n \leq N$ essentially give a parameterization of $\mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{C})$ off of the locus of flexible Lattès maps. Thus, the finite list of possible multipliers of cycles of PCF maps is realized by only finitely many non-Lattès points in $\mathcal{M}_d$.

In light of Theorem 1.1, it is natural to wonder whether the finite set alluded to is effectively computable; the results in [28], for example, provide an effective algorithm for computing the corresponding set in the polynomial case, and work of Goldfeld [23, 24] and Gross-Zagier [25] on the Gauss Conjecture provides an effective way of enumerating j-invariants of CM elliptic curves. Since the elements of a set of bounded height in affine space may be effectively enumerated, the question reduces to whether or not McMullen's theorem may be made effective, that is, whether there is an algorithm to compute the list of rational functions with a given multiplier spectrum. In general, an effective result is not known, but in degree $d = 2$, work of Milnor [34] and Silverman [43] allows one to perform just such a computation, given the following concrete form of Theorem 1.1 as input. Here, h denotes the Weil height.

Corollary 1.3. *Let $\varphi(z) \in \mathbb{C}(z)$ be a rational function of degree 2, and suppose that φ is PCF. If λ is the multiplier of a fixed point of φ, then $h(\lambda) \leq \log 4$.*

Corollary 1.3 can be used to explicitly compute, for any $B \geq 1$, the finitely many conjugacy classes of quadratic rational maps having a representative whose coefficients lie in an extension of $\mathbb{Q}$ of degree at most B. This turns out to be a daunting computation, however, even in the case $B = 1$.

Our method of proof of Theorem 1.2 also yields the following fact about non-archimedean analysis, which may be of independent interest.

Theorem 1.4. *Let K be a field as in Theorem 1.2, let $\varphi(z) \in K(z)$ be a rational function of degree $d \geq 2$ for which $\varphi(\infty) = \infty$, and let $a \in K$. Suppose that a is not a pole of φ, and let r be the radius of the largest punctured disk about $z = a$ which is disjoint from $\varphi^{-1}(\{\varphi(a), \infty\})$. Then there is a critical point β of φ satisfying*

$$|\varphi(\beta) - \varphi(a)| \leq \varepsilon^{-1} r |\varphi'(a)|,$$

where ε is the same constant from Theorem 1.2.

This result contrasts with recent result of Faber [18] on a related topic. He shows that if a rational function over a non-archimedean field has distinct zeros in a closed disk of given radius, then there is a critical point in a disk not much larger (and in fact equal in the case $p = 0$ or $p > d$).

Theorem 1.2 is stated for fixed points, but we may apply it to φ^n and thereby extend the result to n-cycles. It follows that an n-cycle strictly attracts a critical point when it has multiplier λ satisfying $0 < |\lambda| < \varepsilon_{p,d^n}$. This bound is sufficient for the purposes of Theorem 1.1, for which we fix n; but if we wish to consider cycles of arbitrary length, we are hampered by the fact that ε_{p,d^n} becomes arbitrarily small. It turns out, however, that nth iterates of rational functions of degree d are not typical amongst rational functions of degree d^n, and that we can significantly improve the above estimates for n-cycles when $p > d$.

Theorem 1.5. *Let p and K be as in Theorem 1.2, and suppose either that $p = 0$ or that $\varphi(z) \in K(z)$ has degree $d < p$. If γ is an n-periodic point of φ with*

$$0 < |(\varphi^n)'(\gamma)| < 1,$$

then there is a critical point of φ that is strictly attracted to the cycle containing γ.

It is a classical result in holomorphic dynamics over $\mathbb{C}$, proven by both Fatou [19, 20] and Julia [29], that any rational function $\varphi(z) \in \mathbb{C}(z)$ of degree $d \geq 2$ has at most $2d - 2$ attracting cycles; the key fact is that each such cycle attracts a critical point, albeit possibly not strictly. (Shishikura [41] later extended the same bound of $2d - 2$ to all non-repelling cycles.) Theorem 1.5 allows us to give a non-archimedean analogue of the classical result.

Corollary 1.6. *Let K be a non-archimedean field with residue characteristic p, and suppose that $\varphi(z) \in K(z)$ has degree d with $p > d$ or $p = 0$. Then φ has at most $2d - 2$ attracting cycles.*

Rivera-Letelier has proven a similar result [37, Corollaire 4.7 and Corollaire 4.9] under the same hypotheses, with a bound of $3d - 3$. There is no hope of removing the hypothesis $p > d$ or $p = 0$ from Corollary 1.6, as the map z^p has infinitely many attracting cycles over any field of residue characteristic p. Even under those hypotheses, there is also no hope of bounding the number non-repelling cycles, as Shishikura did in the complex case, since any map with good reduction over a non-archimedean field has no repelling cycles. Still, since $\mathbb{C}_p$ is isomorphic (as a field) to $\mathbb{C}$, and because *rationally* indifferent cycles (i.e., cycles whose multiplier is a root of unity) remain rationally indifferent under base change, it follows from Corollary 1.6 and Shishikura's result that under the same hypotheses, the number of attracting cycles plus the number of rationally indifferent cycles is at most $4d - 4$. Presumably this bound is not sharp — no examples with a total of more than $2d - 2$ such cycles are known — but with current technology, we know of no way to improve it, even if we use the more generous counting scheme introduced by Epstein [16].

Another application of Theorem 1.5 is to the case of a global function field.

Corollary 1.7. *Let K be a function field of characteristic p, and suppose that either $p = 0$ or $p > d$. If $\varphi(z) \in K(z)$ is a PCF map of degree d, then the multipliers of all periodic points of φ lie in the algebraic closure of the prime subfield of K.*

In particular, Corollary 1.7 implies that if McMullen's Theorem holds over the algebraic closure of the prime subfield of K, then every PCF map in K is Lattès or isotrivial. Unfortunately, we cannot use Corollary 1.7 to deduce an alternate proof of Thurston's rigidity result [15] for PCF families over $\mathbb{C}$ from McMullen's theorem, since McMullen's proof uses Thurston's machinery. However, in some cases only a McMullen-type result is known, such as for quadratic rational maps over a global function field of odd characteristic. In such cases, we deduce that any PCF map that is not a flexible Lattès map is in fact defined over an algebraic extension of the field of constants, after a change of coordinates (see Corollary 6.3).

Finally, we can reverse the question of Theorem 1.2 and ask what happens around repelling periodic points. It turns out that there exist PCF maps with repelling points, even when the residue characteristic is 0 or $> d$, where such maps could not have attracting points that are not superattracting. In personal communication, Rivera-Letelier points to the example

$$\varphi(z) = -45\frac{3z+5}{z^2(z-9)} \in \mathbb{C}_5(z) \tag{1}$$

which is PCF but has two repelling fixed points — one with absolute value 1, and one with absolute value $|5| < 1$.

However, if we consider polynomials only, it turns out that PCF maps do not have repelling points when the residue characteristic is 0 or $> d$, and in fact they necessarily have potentially good reduction. In Section 7, we use Newton polygons to prove this. The same method can be used to reprove and slightly generalize a result of Epstein [17], which states that in residue characteristic p, PCF polynomials of p-power degree have potentially good reduction.

2. DEFINITIONS AND DEDUCTIONS OF COROLLARIES

We begin with some remarks on the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_d$ of dynamical systems, referring the reader to [42, Chapter 4] for more details. Let Rat_d be the set of rational functions $\varphi : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}^1$, which is naturally identified with an open subset of $\mathbb{P}^{2d+1}$ by simply taking the coefficients of the numerator and denominator of φ and eliminating the locus where the numerator and denominator have a common root. Then Rat_d is a variety defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. Since $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^1) \cong \mathrm{PGL}_2$ acts naturally on rational functions by conjugation, representing a change of coordinates, it makes sense to consider Rat_d up to this action by PGL_2, prompting one to define

$$\mathcal{M}_d = \mathrm{Rat}_d \,/\, \mathrm{PGL}_2\,.$$

In [42, Section 4.4], it is shown that $\mathcal{M}_d$ is an algebraic variety defined over $\mathbb{Z}$, and moreover, that if K is an algebraically closed field, then $\mathcal{M}_d(K)$ consists precisely of the cosets of Rat_d under the conjugation action of $\mathrm{PGL}_2(K)$.

Definition 2.1. The map $\varphi : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}^1$ is called a *Lattès map* if there is an elliptic curve E, a morphism $\alpha : E \to E$, and a finite separable map π such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
E \arrow[r, "\alpha"] \arrow[d, "\pi"'] & E \arrow[d, "\pi"] \\
\mathbb{P}^1 \arrow[r, "\varphi"'] & \mathbb{P}^1
\end{tikzcd}$$

We say that φ is a *flexible Lattès map* if it is obtained by taking π to be the usual double-cover and taking $\alpha(P) = [m]P + T$, where $T \in E[2]$.

Lattès maps are treated more completely in [42, Sections 6.4 and 6.5], where it is shown that non-isomorphic elliptic curves yield non-conjugate Lattès maps [42, Theorem 6.46], and that Lattès maps are PCF [42, Proposition 6.45]. Thus, if we fix m and let E vary, the corresponding flexible Lattès maps give curves in $\mathcal{M}_{m^2}$ that consist of PCF maps.

The dimension of Rat_d is $2d+1$, and that of $\mathcal{M}_d$ is $2d-2$, since $\dim \mathrm{PGL}_2 = 3$ and the PGL_2-automorphism group of each $\varphi \in \mathrm{Rat}_d$ is finite [32, 36]. Since a rational function of degree d has $2d-2$ critical points, we expect that each set of critical orbit relations $\varphi^{m_i}(\zeta_i) = \varphi^{n_i}(\zeta_i)$ on the orbits of the critical points ζ_i of f, with $m_i \neq n_i$, will have only finitely many solutions. As it turns out, all of the flexible Lattès maps in a given family have the same post-critical behavior, and thus they form a counterexample to this *a priori* expectation. However, it follows from a deep result of Thurston [15] that these are the only exceptions in $\mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{C})$. We refer to this result as Thurston rigidity, though Thurston's actual result is considerably more broad.

Theorem 2.2 (**Thurston rigidity**). *Apart from the flexible Lattès maps, there are only finitely many rational maps in $\mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{C})$ satisfying a given set of critical orbit relations. Moreover, all such maps are defined over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$.*

Brezin *et al.* [11, Corollary 3.7] explain how Thurston's result in [15] implies Theorem 2.2.

Another main ingredient in the derivation of many of our corollaries is a celebrated result of McMullen [33]. Let $\Lambda_n : \mathcal{M}_d \to \mathbb{A}^{k_n}$ denote the *multiplier spectrum map*, i.e., the map sending φ to the unordered set of multipliers of its period-n cycles (more precisely, to the elementary symmetric functions in the multipliers).

Theorem 2.3 (**McMullen**). *Fix $d \geq 2$. For sufficiently large n the map*

$$\Lambda_1 \times \cdots \times \Lambda_n : \mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{C}) \to \mathbb{A}^{k_1+\cdots+k_n}(\mathbb{C}) \tag{2}$$

is finite-to-one away from the flexible Lattès curves.

One can compute the multiplier spectra corresponding to Lattès maps in a given family [42, Proposition 6.52], and see that these families are isospectral. Thus, the map in (2) compresses each such family down to a single point. The fact that the flexible Lattès maps truly are exceptional in McMullen's theorem is crucial for the proof of Theorem 1.1, since $\mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{C})$ contains infinitely many flexible Lattès maps defined over any given number field, as long as d is a perfect square.

The last preliminary notion we require is the standard Weil height on $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$.

Definition 2.4. The *Weil height*, or simply the *height*, of an algebraic number $\alpha \in K$, where K is a finite extension of $\mathbb{Q}$, is defined by

$$h(\alpha) = \sum_{v \in M_K} \frac{[K_v : \mathbb{Q}_v]}{[K : \mathbb{Q}]} \log \max\{1, |\alpha|_v\}, \tag{3}$$

where M_K denotes the set of absolute values of K, normalized in the standard way, and K_v denotes the completion of K with respect to the absolute value v.

It is routine to check that the quantity (3) does not depend on the field K, and hence (3) gives a well-defined function $h : \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \to \mathbb{R}$. The definition for heights over functions fields is completely analogous. We refer the reader to [42, Chapter 3] for more details on Weil heights.

Northcott's fundamental result in arithmetic geometry [35] states that there are only finitely many algebraic numbers of bounded height and bounded degree. In other words, for every pair of non-negative integers A and B, there are only finitely many values $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ satisfying both

$$h(\alpha) \le A \quad \text{and} \quad [\mathbb{Q}(\alpha) : \mathbb{Q}] \le B.$$

(The analogous result holds for function fields if and only if the field of constants is finite.) Moreover, this finite set of points is effectively computable, since a bound on the height of an algebraic number yields a bound on the size of the coefficients of its minimal polynomial over $\mathbb{Z}$. Finally, a classical result of Kronecker implies that, over number fields, $h(\alpha) = 0$ precisely if $\alpha = 0$ or α is a root of unity (in dynamical terminology: precisely if α is preperiodic for $z \mapsto z^2$). In the function field setting, the condition $h(\alpha) = 0$ is equivalent to α being a constant.

We are now in a position to prove Theorem 1.1, assuming Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let φ be a PCF map of degree d defined over an extension of $\mathbb{Q}$ of degree at most B. We will show that the multipliers of the n-cycles of φ are contained in a set of bounded height and algebraic degree, and that these bounds depend only on B, d, and n, but not on φ. For fixed n, then, there are only finitely many algebraic numbers λ which could possibly be the multipliers of n-cycles of a PCF map $\varphi(z) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ whose coefficients generate an extension of $\mathbb{Q}$ of degree no greater than B, by the result of Northcott [35]. In other words, in the notation of Theorem 2.3 above, there is a finite set $X_{B,d,n}$ such that $\Lambda_n(\varphi) \in X_{B,d,n}$ whenever $\varphi(z) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a PCF map of degree d, defined over an extension of $\mathbb{Q}$ of algebraic degree at most

B. But by Theorem 2.3, we may choose some n, depending only on d, such that the fibers of the map

$$\Lambda_1 \times \cdots \times \Lambda_n : \mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{C}) \to \mathbb{A}^{k_1+\cdots+k_n}(\mathbb{C})$$

are finite, away from the flexible Lattès maps. In particular, there will be only finitely many conjugacy classes of non-Lattès maps which land, under this map, in the finite set $X_{B,d,1} \times X_{B,d,2} \times \cdots \times X_{B,d,n}$. Theorem 1.1 follows as soon as we establish the aforementioned height bound, since it is trivial to obtain bounds on the algebraic degrees of the multipliers.

Thus, we suppose that $\varphi(z) \in K(z)$ is PCF, where $[K : \mathbb{Q}] \leq B$, and let E/K be the extension generated by the fixed points of φ. Note that $[E : K]$ is bounded in terms of d, and that the multipliers of the fixed points of φ are all contained in E. Let M_E denote the set of absolute values of E, normalized in the standard way. For each $v \in M_E$, let $\mathbb{C}_v$ denote the completion of the algebraic closure of the v-adic completion of E. The key observation is that there can be no critical point $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}_v$ of φ that is strictly attracted to a fixed point of φ. If that were the case, then that critical point would have an infinite orbit, contradicting our assumption about φ.

Let λ be the multiplier of any of the fixed points of φ. If $\lambda = 0$, then $h(\lambda) = 0$; hence, we may assume that $\lambda \neq 0$. If $v \in M_E$ is archimedean, and therefore $\mathbb{C}_v = \mathbb{C}$, then we may apply Fatou's result, and conclude that

$$|\lambda|_v \geq 1. \tag{4}$$

If v is non-archimedean, then v extends some p-adic absolute value on $\mathbb{Q}$, and we write $v \mid p$. In this case, we may similarly apply Theorem 1.2 to φ over $\mathbb{C}_v$, and thus obtain that

$$|\lambda|_v \geq \varepsilon_{p,d}.$$

We now invoke the standard fact [42, Proposition 3.2] that for any prime p we have

$$\sum_{\substack{v \in M_E \\ v \mid p}} \frac{[E_v : \mathbb{Q}_v]}{[E : \mathbb{Q}]} = 1,$$

to obtain from Definition 2.4

$$\begin{aligned} h(\lambda) = h(\lambda^{-1}) &= \sum_{v \in M_E} \frac{[E_v : \mathbb{Q}_v]}{[E : \mathbb{Q}]} \log \max\{1, |\lambda^{-1}|_v\} \\ &\leq \sum_{p \text{ prime}} \sum_{\substack{v \in M_E \\ v \mid p}} \frac{[E_v : \mathbb{Q}_v]}{[E : \mathbb{Q}]} \log \varepsilon_{p,d}^{-1} = \sum_{p \leq d} \log \varepsilon_{p,d}^{-1}, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where the first equality is a standard result of the product formula (see [42, Proposition 3.3]), the inequality comes from discarding the archimedean places in light of (4), and the final equality is because $\varepsilon_{p,d} = 1$ for all $p > d$. Note that the bound in (5) is finite and depends only on p and d.

To summarize, we have shown that if $\varphi(z) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}(z)$ has degree d and is defined over an extension of degree at most B, then the multipliers of the fixed points of φ lie in a set of bounded height and algebraic degree, where both bounds depend on B and d, but not on the particular map φ. Applying this result to the iterate φ^n shows that the same is true of the multipliers of the points of period n, although the bound now depends on B, d, and n. Thus, the set $X_{B,d,n}$ defined above is indeed finite. $\square$

Note that we can be quite explicit about the bound on $h(\lambda)$. Recalling from Theorem 1.2 that

$$\varepsilon_{p,d} = \min\left\{|m|_p^d : 1 \leq m \leq d\right\},$$

our height bound for multipliers of fixed points of PCF maps of degree $d \geq 2$ becomes

$$h(\lambda) \leq d \sum_{p \leq d} \log \max\{|m|_p^{-1} : 1 \leq m \leq d\} = d \sum_{n \leq d} \Lambda(n),$$

where Λ now denotes the von Mangoldt function [2, Section 2.8]. Since the prime number theorem is equivalent to the fact that $\sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n)$ is asymptotic to x, our upper bound is asymptotic to d^2, although the quality of the error term depends on which conjectures of analytic number theory one is prepared to adopt.

It remains to prove Theorems 1.2 and 1.4, which we do in Section 4, and Theorem 1.5, which appears in Section 6.

3. Background on non-archimedean analysis

In this section, we summarize the definitions and results on non-archimedean analysis, and especially Berkovich spaces, that we will need to prove Theorem 1.2.

Fix an algebraically closed non-archimedean field K with absolute value $|\cdot|$ as in Theorem 1.2. By an *open disk* in $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$ we mean an open disk

$$D(a, r) = \{x \in K : |x - a| < r\}$$

in K or the complement $\mathbb{P}^1(K) \smallsetminus \overline{D}(a, r)$ of a closed disk in K. Similarly, a *closed disk* in $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$ is either a closed disk in K or the complement of an open disk in K. In either case, we say the disk is *rational* if the radius $r > 0$ lies in $|K^\times|$.

A *closed* (respectively, *open*) *connected affinoid* is the intersection of finitely many closed (respectively, open) disks in $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$. We say the affinoid is *rational* if all the disks in the intersection are rational.

Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{P}^1(K)$ be a connected affinoid, and let $h \in K(z)$ be a rational function of degree $d \geq 1$. Then $h^{-1}(U)$ is the disjoint union of $1 \leq \ell \leq d$ connected affinoids $V_1, \ldots, V_\ell$, where for each $i = 1, \ldots, \ell$, there is an integer $1 \leq m_i \leq d$ such that h maps V_i everywhere m_i-to-one onto U. Moreover, $m_1 + \cdots + m_\ell = d$. (See [5, Proposition 2.5.3] or [37, Proposition 2.6], for example.) The connected affinoids $V_1, \ldots, V_\ell$ are called the *components* of $h^{-1}(U)$. If U is closed (respectively, open, rational), then every component V_i of $h^{-1}(U)$ is also closed (respectively, open, rational). Moreover, if U is a disk and $m_i = 1$, then V_i is also a disk. In addition, if $U \subseteq K$ is a finite disk and h is a polynomial, then each V_i is also a disk. For further information on affinoids and rigid analysis, see [9, 14, 21].

The Berkovich projective line $\mathbb{P}^1_{\text{Berk}}$ over K is a certain space of multiplicative seminorms on K-algebras. It contains $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$ as a subspace but is path-connected, compact, and Hausdorff. The Berkovich affine line over K is defined to be $\mathbb{A}^1_{\text{Berk}} = \mathbb{P}^1_{\text{Berk}} \smallsetminus \{\infty\}$, the Berkovich hyperbolic space is $\mathbb{H}_{\text{Berk}} = \mathbb{P}^1_{\text{Berk}} \setminus \mathbb{P}^1(K)$. The full definition of $\mathbb{P}^1_{\text{Berk}}$ is rather involved; for details, the interested reader may consult Berkovich's original presentation in [7], the thorough exposition in [3], or the summaries in [6, Section 4], [22, Sections 2.1–2.2], and [42, Section 5.10]. Still, we present a general description here, without proofs.

Each point $\zeta \in \mathbb{A}^1_{\text{Berk}}$ is associated to a multiplicative seminorm on $K[z]$ extending $|\cdot|$, and we denote this seminorm by $\|\cdot\|_\zeta$. As a typical example, for each closed disk $\overline{D}(a, r) \subseteq K$ of finite radius $r > 0$, there is a corresponding point $\zeta(a, r)$ in Berkovich space defined by

$$\|f\|_{\zeta(a,r)} = \sup\{|f(z)| : z \in \overline{D}(a, r)\}.$$

Equivalently, if we write $f(z) = \sum_i c_i(z - a)^i$, we have $\|f\|_{\zeta(a,r)} = \sup\{|c_i|r^i : i \geq 0\}$. The point $\zeta(a, r)$ is said to be of type II if $r \in |K^\times|$, or of type III if $r \in (0, \infty) \smallsetminus |K^\times|$. In other words, type II Berkovich points correspond to rational closed disks in K, and type III Berkovich points correspond to irrational closed disks in K.

Meanwhile, each $x \in K$ induces a seminorm $\|\cdot\|_x$ defined by $\|f\|_x = |f(x)|$. Such seminorms are the type I points of $\mathbb{A}^1_{\text{Berk}}$, and the mapping $K \to \mathbb{A}^1_{\text{Berk}}$ by $x \mapsto \|\cdot\|_x$ is a topological embedding. There are also points of type IV, corresponding to decreasing chains of disks with empty intersection, but such points will not concern us here. The hyperbolic space $\mathbb{H}_{\text{Berk}}$ consists of the points of types II, III, and IV.

Any seminorm $\|\cdot\|_\zeta$ in $\mathbb{H}_{\text{Berk}}$ may be extended to $K(z)$ by setting $\|f/g\|_\zeta = \|f\|_\zeta/\|g\|_\zeta$, which is independent of the choice of polynomials $f, g \in K[z]$ representing the rational function f/g. The same definition also makes sense at type I points $x \in K$, provided we allow $\|f/g\|_x$ to take on the value ∞ if $g(x) = 0$. Meanwhile, we may define $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ at the one remaining point $\infty \in \mathbb{P}^1_{\text{Berk}}$ by setting $\|h(z)\|_\infty = \|h(1/z)\|_0$ for any $h \in K(z)$.

Any point $\zeta \in \mathbb{P}^1_{\text{Berk}}$ has a radius $\text{rad}(\zeta) \in [0, \infty]$, defined by

$$\text{rad}(\zeta) = \inf\{\|z - a\|_\zeta : a \in K\}.$$

In particular, if $\zeta = \zeta(a, r)$ is a point of type II or III, corresponding to the closed disk $\overline{D}(a, r)$, then $\text{rad}(\zeta) = r$. Meanwhile, $\text{rad}(a) = 0$ for each type I point $a \in K$, and $\text{rad}(\infty) = \infty$. The reader should be warned that the function $\text{rad} : \mathbb{P}^1_{\text{Berk}} \to [0, \infty]$ is not continuous, but only upper semicontinuous. However, rad is continuous on line segments in $\mathbb{P}^1_{\text{Berk}}$. Specifically, fix any point $a \in K$, and let L_a be the line segment in

$\mathbb{P}^1_{\text{Berk}}$ from a to ∞. Then rad is continuous on L_a, and in fact $\log \circ \text{rad} : L_a \to [-\infty,\infty]$ is a homeomorphism, with inverse $t \mapsto \zeta(a, \exp(t))$.

Given $\zeta \in \mathbb{P}^1_{\text{Berk}}$, each connected component of $\mathbb{P}^1_{\text{Berk}} \smallsetminus \{\zeta\}$ is called a *tangent direction* at ζ. If $\zeta = \zeta(a,r)$ is of type III, then it has two tangent directions: the component containing ∞ and the component containing a. On the other hand, if $\zeta = \zeta(a,|c|)$ is of type II, then it has infinitely many tangent directions: one containing ∞, and one containing each point $a+cu$, as $u \in K$ ranges over a set of representatives of the residue field of K. A point of type I or IV has only one tangent direction.

For any fixed nonzero rational function $h \in K(z)$, the function $\zeta \mapsto \|h\|_\zeta$ from $\mathbb{P}^1_{\text{Berk}}$ to $[0,\infty]$ is continuous. (This statement is essentially the definition of the topology on $\mathbb{P}^1_{\text{Berk}}$.) For any fixed $a \in K$, the graph of the function $\log t \mapsto \log \|h\|_{\zeta(a,t)}$ is called the *valuation polygon* or *Newton copolygon* of the rational function $h(z-a)$. This function, which is the composition of the homeomorphism $\zeta(a, \exp(\cdot)) : [-\infty,\infty] \to L_a$ with the map $\zeta \mapsto \|h\|_\zeta$, is continuous and piecewise linear, and the slope of each of its segments is necessarily an integer. More precisely, for any point $\zeta = \zeta(a,r)$ of type II or III and any $b \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$, set $N_a^+(h, \zeta(a,r), b)$ to be the nonnegative integer

$$N_a^+(h, \zeta(a,r), b) = \#\{z \in \overline{D}(a,r) : h(z) = b\},$$

counted with multiplicity, and define $N_a^-(h, \zeta(a,r), b)$ similarly relative to the open disk $D(a,r)$. Then the Newton copolygon function $\log t \mapsto \log \|h\|_{\zeta(a,t)}$ from $[-\infty,\infty]$ to $[-\infty,\infty]$ has integer slope to the left of $\log r$ given by

$$N_a^-(h, \zeta(a,r), 0) - N_a^-(h, \zeta(a,r), \infty), \tag{6}$$

and to the right of $\log r$ given by

$$N_a^+(h, \zeta(a,r), 0) - N_a^+(h, \zeta(a,r), \infty). \tag{7}$$

This integer is precisely the Weierstrass degree (i.e., the degree of the term of maximal absolute value) of the Laurent series expansion $h(z) = \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} c_i (z-a)^i$ on the annulus $X^- = D(a,r) \smallsetminus \overline{D}(a, r-\varepsilon)$ or $X^+ = D(a, r+\varepsilon) \smallsetminus \overline{D}(a,r)$, respectively, for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. For further details on valuation polygons, see the foundational work in [38], as well as the expositions in [39, VI.1.6,VI.3.3] and [6, Section 6]. For example, a proof of the piecewise linearity statement above may be found in [38, Section 3] or [39, VI.1.6ff], albeit not phrased in the language of Berkovich spaces.

Any rational function $\varphi \in K(z)$ induces a continuous function $\varphi : \mathbb{P}^1_{\text{Berk}} \to \mathbb{P}^1_{\text{Berk}}$, where for each $\zeta \in \mathbb{P}^1_{\text{Berk}}$, the image $\varphi(\zeta)$ is the seminorm defined by

$$\|h\|_{\varphi(\zeta)} = \|h \circ \varphi\|_\zeta \qquad \text{for all } h \in K(z).$$

It is easy to check that for type I points $\zeta = x \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$, this definition of $\varphi(x)$ coincides with the usual action of φ on $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$. If φ is nonconstant, then for any $\zeta \in \mathbb{P}^1_{\text{Berk}}$, its image $\varphi(\zeta)$ is a point of the same type. If $\zeta = \zeta(a,r) \in \mathbb{P}^1_{\text{Berk}}$ is of type II or III, then for each tangent direction $\vec{v}$ at ζ, φ induces a tangent direction $\varphi_*(\vec{v})$ at

$\varphi(\zeta)$, as follows. If $\vec{v}$ is the tangent direction containing ∞, then for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, the image $\varphi(X)$ of the annulus $X = D(a, r+\varepsilon) \smallsetminus \overline{D}(a, r)$ is contained in a single tangent direction $\vec{w}$ at $\varphi(\zeta)$. Otherwise, if $\vec{v}$ is the tangent direction containing $b \in \overline{D}(a, r)$, then for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, the image $\varphi(X)$ of the annulus $X = D(b, r) \smallsetminus \overline{D}(b, r - \varepsilon)$ is contained in a single tangent direction $\vec{w}$ at $\varphi(\zeta)$. In either case, the image $\varphi(X)$ is an annulus of the form either $D(c, s + \delta) \smallsetminus \overline{D}(c, s)$ or $D(c, s) \smallsetminus \overline{D}(c, s - \delta)$, the image point $\varphi(\zeta)$ may be written as $\varphi(\zeta) = \zeta(c, s)$, and the image direction is defined to be $\varphi_*(\vec{v}) = \vec{w}$, the direction at $\varphi(\zeta)$ containing $\varphi(X)$.

Just as φ maps points of $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$ to one another with multiplicity, φ_* also maps tangent directions to one another with multiplicity. Indeed, the annulus X in the previous paragraph maps to its image with some multiplicity $1 \le m \le \deg \varphi$ that is independent of the sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. We define the multiplicity $\deg_{\zeta,\vec{v}}(\varphi)$ of φ in the direction $\vec{v}$ at ζ to be this integer m. If $\varphi(\zeta) = \zeta(0, s)$ and $\varphi_*(\vec{v})$ is the direction at $\zeta(0, s)$ of either 0 or ∞, then $\deg_{\zeta,\vec{v}}(\varphi) = |m|_\infty$, where m is the Weierstrass degree (necessarily nonzero in this case) on the appropriate annulus from either (6) or (7), respectively, and $|\cdot|_\infty$ denotes the (usual) archimedean absolute value. Readers familiar with $\mathbb{P}^1_{\text{Berk}}$ will recognize that the integer $m = \deg_{\zeta,\vec{v}}(\varphi)$ is denoted $m_\varphi(\zeta, \vec{v})$ in [3, Section 9.1]; previously, in [37, Lemme 2.1], with $\vec{v}$ denoted $\mathcal{P}$ and referred to as a “bout”, or end, it had been denoted $\deg_\varphi(\mathcal{P})$. It is less than or equal to the multiplicity or local degree of φ at ζ, denoted by $m_\varphi(\zeta)$ in [3], and by $\deg_\varphi(\zeta)$ in [37, 22].

The multiplicities $\deg_{\zeta,\vec{v}}(\varphi)$ satisfy the following useful properties.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\varphi, \psi \in K(z)$ be rational functions, let $\zeta \in \mathbb{H}_{\text{Berk}}$, and let $\vec{v}$ be a direction at ζ. Then*

$$\deg_{\zeta,\vec{v}}(\psi \circ \varphi) = \deg_{\varphi(\zeta),\varphi_*(\vec{v})}(\psi) \cdot \deg_{\zeta,\vec{v}}(\varphi).$$

Proof. Although this statement is true for points of all types, we will only use or prove it for types II and III. Let X be a sufficiently small annulus abutting ζ, and let $Y = \varphi(X)$. Then because $\varphi : X \to Y$ has degree $\deg_{\zeta,\vec{v}}(\varphi)$, and $\psi : Y \to \psi(Y)$ has degree $\deg_{\varphi(\zeta),\varphi_*(\vec{v})}(\psi)$, the desired equality is immediate. ☐

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\varphi \in K(z)$, let $\zeta \in \mathbb{H}_{\text{Berk}}$, and let $a \in K$. Let $\vec{v}$ be the direction at ζ containing a, let $\vec{w}$ be the direction at ζ containing ∞, and assume that $\vec{v} \neq \vec{w}$.*

a. If $\varphi_*(\vec{v})$ is the direction at $\varphi(\zeta)$ containing 0, then

$$\deg_{\zeta,\vec{v}} = N_a^-(\varphi, \zeta, 0) - N_a^-(h, \zeta, \infty) \ge 1.$$

b. If $\varphi_*(\vec{w})$ is the direction at $\varphi(\zeta)$ containing 0, then

$$\deg_{\zeta,\vec{w}} = -N_a^+(\varphi, \zeta, 0) + N_a^+(h, \zeta, \infty) \ge 1.$$

Proof. This is simply the alternate characterization of the tangent direction multiplicities in terms of the Weierstrass degrees (6) and (7). ☐

We close this section by describing another function on $\mathbb{H}_{\text{Berk}}$, similar to one introduced in [6, Section 6]. Fix a nonzero rational function $\varphi \in K(z) \smallsetminus \{0\}$. Define the *distortion* of φ to be the real-valued function $\delta(\varphi, \cdot)$ on $\mathbb{H}_{\text{Berk}}$ given by

$$\delta(\varphi, \zeta) = \log \operatorname{rad}(\zeta) + \log \|\varphi'\|_\zeta - \log \|\varphi\|_\zeta. \tag{8}$$

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\varphi \in K(z) \smallsetminus \{0\}$, let $a \in K$, let $r > 0$, and set $\zeta = \zeta(a, r)$. Then*

$$\log |N_a^{\pm}(\varphi, \zeta, 0) - N_a^{\pm}(\varphi, \zeta, \infty)| \le \delta(\varphi, \zeta) \le 0, \tag{9}$$

where $|\cdot|$ denotes, as always, the absolute value on K.

Proof. We will prove the lower bound for N_a^-; the proof for N_a^+ is similar. After a change of coordinates on the domain, we may assume that $a = 0$ and expand $\varphi(z)$ as a Laurent series $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} c_i z^i$ on a sufficiently small annulus $X = \{x \in K : r - \varepsilon < |x| < r\}$. Setting $m = N_a^-(\varphi, \zeta(0, r), 0) - N_a^-(h, \zeta(0, r), \infty)$, we have $|\varphi(x)| = |c_m x^m| > |c_i x^i|$ for all $x \in X$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z} \smallsetminus \{m\}$. Thus, for all $t \in (r - \varepsilon, r)$, we have

$$t \|\varphi'\|_{\zeta(0,t)} = t \sup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} |i c_i| t^{i-1} \ge |n c_n| t^n = |n| \cdot \|\varphi\|_{\zeta(0,t)},$$

and hence $\delta(h, \zeta(0, t)) \ge |n|$. In addition,

$$t \|\varphi'\|_{\zeta(0,t)} = t \sup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} |i c_i| t^{i-1} \le t \sup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} |c_i| t^{i-1} = \sup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} |c_i| t^i = \|\varphi\|_{\zeta(0,t)},$$

and hence $\delta(\varphi, \zeta(0, t)) \le 1$. (See also [6, inequality (6.5)].) The desired bounds are now immediate by taking limits as $t \nearrow r$, by the continuity of rad, $\zeta \mapsto \|\varphi\|_\zeta$, and $\zeta \mapsto \|\varphi'\|_\zeta$ on the line segment $L_0 \subseteq \mathbb{P}^1_{\text{Berk}}$. ☐

Remark 3.4. Combining the previous two lemmas, note that under the hypotheses of Lemma 3.2, the distortion $\delta(\varphi, \zeta)$ is bounded below by $\log |\deg_{\zeta, \vec{v}}(\varphi)|$, which is finite if $\operatorname{char} K = 0$. Specifically, under the same hypotheses, $\delta(\varphi, \zeta)$ is bounded below by $\min\{\log |m| : 1 \le m \le \deg \varphi\}$. This fact will be essential in our proof of Theorem 1.2.

4. PROOF OF THEOREMS 1.2 AND 1.4

In this section, we establish Theorem 1.2, using using an argument on the Berkovich analytic space $\mathbb{P}^1_{\text{Berk}}$ associated to $\mathbb{P}^1_K$. The outline of the proof is as follows. First, there is a maximal open disk U containing the attracting fixed point γ, with the property that φ contracts all distances in U by a factor of exactly $|\varphi'(\gamma)|$. In particular, all points in U are strictly attracted to γ, and hence it suffices to show that $U \smallsetminus \{\gamma\}$ contains a critical value. We define a certain function $G : \mathbb{P}^1_{\text{Berk}} \to [-\infty, \infty]$ that involves the Newton copolygons of φ and φ'; the slopes of G count the numbers of zeros, poles, and critical points of φ inside various disks. By controlling the growth of G and then using these slopes to count carefully, we will be able to show that there are more critical points in $\varphi^{-1}(U)$ than can map to γ.

More precisely, Theorem 1.2 will be a consequence of the following.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\varphi \in K(z)$ be a rational function of degree $d \geq 1$, and suppose that φ has a fixed point γ with multiplier $\lambda \neq 0$ satisfying*

$$0 < |\lambda| < |\deg_{\zeta,\vec{v}} \varphi|^d \tag{10}$$

for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{P}^1_{\mathrm{Berk}}$ and all directions $\vec{v}$ at ζ. Then there is a disk $U \subseteq \mathbb{P}^1(K)$ containing γ such that φ maps U into itself injectively, all points of U are attracted to γ under iteration, and U contains a critical value that is strictly attracted to γ.

Remark 4.2. We will prove Lemma 4.1 using a much weaker assumption, as we will consider $\deg_{\zeta,\vec{v}} \varphi$ only at a few points ζ in the immediate attracting basin of γ.

Proof of Lemma 4.1. After a change of variables, we may make the following three assumptions: that $\gamma = 0$, that $\varphi(\infty) = \infty$, and that the minimum absolute value of a non-zero root or pole of φ is 1. (The second assumption is legitimate because φ has at least one other fixed point, and the third is because we may then conjugate by a map of the form $z \mapsto cz$.) Define $U = D(0,1)$. Note that because φ has no poles in U and only the simple zero at $z = 0$, we have $|\varphi(z)| = |\lambda z|$ for all $z \in U$. Thus $\varphi(U) = D(0, |\lambda|)$, which is a proper subset of U.

Let V be the connected component of $\varphi^{-1}(U)$ containing U, so that U is a proper subset of V, and φ is an m-to-1 map of V onto U, for some integer $1 \leq m \leq d$. We may write $V = D(0,R) \smallsetminus (W_1 \cup \cdots \cup W_n)$, where $R > 1$ and each $W_i = \overline{D}(b_i, s_i)$ is a rational closed disk contained in $D(0,R)$ and not intersecting $D(0,1)$. We have $\varphi(\zeta(0,R)) = \zeta(0,1)$ and $\varphi(\zeta(b_i, r_i)) = \zeta(0,1)$ for each $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

Define $G : \mathbb{H}_{\mathrm{Berk}} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$G(\zeta) = m\delta(\varphi, \zeta) + \log \|\varphi\|_\zeta = m \log \operatorname{rad}(\zeta) + m \log \|\varphi'\|_\zeta + (1-m) \log \|\varphi\|_\zeta.$$

Note that G is continuous along any line segment in $\mathbb{H}_{\mathrm{Berk}}$.

First, since $\|\varphi\|_{\zeta(0,1)} = |\lambda|$ and $N_0^-(\varphi, \zeta(0,1), 0) - N_0^-(\varphi, \zeta(0,1), \infty) = 1$, Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3 imply that

$$G(\zeta(0,1)) = m \cdot 0 + \log|\lambda| = \log|\lambda|.$$

On the other hand, the same two lemmas together with the assumption (10) show that

$$G(\zeta(0,R)) \geq m \log |N_0^-(\varphi, \zeta(0,R), 0) - N_0^-(\varphi, \zeta(0,R), \infty)| > G(\zeta(0,1)).$$

By the same reasoning, for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, we have

$$G(\zeta(b_i, r_i)) \geq m \log |N_{b_i}^+(\varphi, \zeta(b_i, r_i), 0) - N_{b_i}^+(\varphi, \zeta(b_i, r_i), \infty| > G(\zeta(0,1)).$$

Consider the unique interval in $\mathbb{H}_{\mathrm{Berk}}$ from $\zeta(0,1)$ to $\zeta(0,R)$, which we identify with the real interval $[0,\log R]$. Since the function $\log r \mapsto G(\zeta(0,r))$ on $[0,\log R]$ is piecewise linear and continuous, and since $G(\zeta(0,R)) > G(\zeta(0,1))$, there must be some subinterval along which G is increasing. On the other hand, the slope of this function is precisely

$$m[1+N_0^+(\varphi',\zeta,0)-N_0^+(\varphi',\zeta,\infty)]+(1-m)[N_0^+(\varphi,\zeta,0)-N_0^+(\varphi,\zeta,\infty)], \tag{11}$$

where $\zeta = \zeta(0,r)$, at each point $\log r$ at which the function is smooth. Thus, the integer (11) must be positive, and hence at least 1, for some $r \in [1,R)$; let S denote the infimum of all such r. By right-continuity of N_0^+, it must be the case that

$$\begin{aligned}m[1+N_0^+(\varphi',\zeta(0,S),0)-N_0^+(\varphi',\zeta(0,S),\infty)]&\\ +(1-m)[N_0^+(\varphi,\zeta(0,S),0)-N_0^+(\varphi,\zeta(0,S),\infty)]&\geq 1.\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

If $G(\zeta(0,S)) > G(\zeta(0,1))$, then again there must be a subinterval of $[1,S]$ along which G is increasing, which contradicts the definition of S. Thus, we must have

$$G(\zeta(0,S)) \leq G(\zeta(0,1)) < G(\zeta(b_i,r_i))$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Once again, then, G must increase along some subinterval of the interval in $\mathbb{P}^1_{\mathrm{Berk}}$ running from $\zeta(0,S)$ to $\zeta(b_i,s_i)$. We discard each index i for which $b_i \notin \overline{D}(0,S)$ and suppose, without loss of generality, that the remaining indices are $i = 1,\ldots,k$.

For each i, we again identify the interval in $\mathbb{H}_{\mathrm{Berk}}$ from $\zeta(0,S)=\zeta(b_i,S)$ to $\zeta(b_i,r_i)$ with the real interval $[\log r_i, \log S]$; indeed, the former consists of all Berkovich points of the form $\zeta(b_i,r)$ with $r_i \leq r \leq S$. As before, because the continuous, piecewise linear function $\log r \mapsto \log G(\zeta(b_i,r))$ is greater at $\log r_i$ than at $\log S$, there must be points $\log r$ at which the slope of this function is negative, and hence at most -1. Let s_i be the supremum of all such r. By the left-continuity of $N_{b_i}^-$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}m[1+N_{b_i}^-(\varphi',\zeta(b_i,s_i),0)-N_{b_i}^-(\varphi',\zeta(b_i,s_i),\infty)]&\\ +(1-m)[N_{b_i}^-(\varphi,\zeta(b_i,s_i),0)-N_{b_i}^-(\varphi,\zeta(b_i,s_i),\infty)]&\leq -1.\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Let $W = \overline{D}(0,S)\smallsetminus[D(b_1,s_1)\cup\cdots\cup D(b_k,s_k)]$, and for any $h \in K(z)$ and $a \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$, let $N(h,W,a)$ be the number of roots of $h(z)=a$ in W, counting multiplicity. Summing inequality (13) across $i=1,\ldots,k$ and subtracting from inequality (12), we have

$$m[(1-k)+N(\varphi',W,0)-N(\varphi',W,\infty)]+(1-m)[N(\varphi,W,0)-N(\varphi,W,\infty)] \geq 1+k.$$

However, $W \subseteq V$, and therefore $\varphi(W) \subseteq \varphi(V) = U$. In particular, φ has no poles in W, and hence neither does φ'. Thus,

$$m[(1-k)+N(\varphi',W,0)]+(1-m)[N(\varphi,W,0)] \geq 1+k. \tag{14}$$

Let $M \geq 0$ denote the number of critical points in W that are *not* zeros of φ. Then because $z = 0 \in W$ is a simple zero of φ, we have

$$N(\varphi', W, 0) \leq M + N(\varphi, W, 0) - 2, \tag{15}$$

using the fact that if both φ and φ' have a zero at $x \in K$, then the order of vanishing of φ' at x is one less than the order of vanishing of φ at x. Combining inequalities (14) and (15) then gives

$$m(1 - k + M - 2) + N(\varphi, W, 0) \geq 1 + k,$$

and hence

$$mM \geq (1 + k)(1 + m) - N(\varphi, W, 0) \geq (1 + k)(1 + m) - m > 0.$$

Thus, $M > 0$, which is to say that there is a critical point $\alpha \in W$ such that $\varphi(\alpha) \in U \smallsetminus \{0\}$. However, recall that $\varphi : U \to U$ has the property that $|\varphi(z)| = |\lambda z|$ for all $z \in U$. Thus, $\varphi^n(\alpha) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, but $\varphi^n(\alpha) \neq 0$ for all $n \geq 0$, as desired. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. As described in Section 3, we have $1 \leq \deg_{\zeta,\vec{v}} \varphi \leq d$ for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{P}^1_{\text{Berk}}$ and all directions $\vec{v}$ at ζ. Since we had $\varepsilon = \min\{|m|^d : 1 \leq m \leq d\}$, inequality (10) holds for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{P}^1_{\text{Berk}}$. Thus, the conclusion of Theorem 1.2 is immediate from Lemma 4.1. □

Proof of Theorem 1.4. If $\varphi'(a) = 0$, then the result is trivial, as a is a suitable critical point. We may therefore assume that $\varphi'(a) \neq 0$. We may also choose $c \in K$ with $|c| < \varepsilon/|\varphi'(a)|$, and with $|c|$ arbitrarily close to $\varepsilon/|\varphi'(a)|$. Recalling that $\varphi(a) \neq \infty$ by hypothesis, define $h(z) = c(z - \varphi(a)) + a$, and $\psi(z) = h(\varphi(z))$. Then $\psi(\infty) = \infty$, $\psi(a) = a$, and $\psi'(a) = c\varphi'(a)$ satisfies $0 < |\psi'(a)| < \varepsilon$.

Applying Lemma 4.1 to ψ produces a disk $U \subseteq \mathbb{P}^1(K)$ containing a and a critical point β such that

1. ψ maps U into itself injectively,
2. $\psi^n(x) \to a$ for all $x \in U$, and
3. $\psi(\beta) \in U$.

By property (2), we have $\infty \notin U$, and therefore property (1) implies that $U \smallsetminus \{a\}$ does not intersect $\psi^{-1}(\{a, \infty\}) = \varphi^{-1}(\{\varphi(a), \infty\})$. In other words, U is contained in the largest disk $V \subseteq K$ containing a but no other points of $\varphi^{-1}(\{\varphi(a), \infty\})$. By hypothesis, however, $V = D(a, r)$.

Meanwhile, φ and ψ have the same critical points; in particular, β is a critical point of φ. Noting that the inverse function of h is $h^{-1}(z) = c^{-1}(z - a) + \varphi(a)$, we compute

$$\varphi(\beta) = h^{-1}(\psi(\beta)) \in h^{-1}(U) \subseteq h^{-1}(D(a, r)) = D(\varphi(a), |c|^{-1} r).$$

Taking the intersection of the disks $D(\varphi(a), |c|^{-1}r)$ across all $c \in K$ with $|c| < \varepsilon/|\varphi'(a)|$, and bearing in mind that φ has only finitely many critical points, it follows that there is a critical point β satisfying $\varphi(\beta) \in \overline{D}(\varphi(a), \varepsilon^{-1}r|\varphi'(a)|)$, as desired. □

5. Sharpness of the Bounds

As we commented in the introduction, the bound $\varepsilon_{p,d}$ of Theorem 1.2 can be improved for polynomials.

Theorem 5.1. *Let K, $|\cdot|$, p, and d be as in Theorem 1.2, and define*

$$\varepsilon = \varepsilon_{p,d}^{\text{poly}} = \min\{|m|^m : 1 \le m \le d\} \ge \varepsilon_{p,d}.$$

Let $\varphi(z) \in K[z]$ be a polynomial of degree d, and let γ be a fixed point of φ satisfying

$$0 < |\varphi'(\gamma)| < \varepsilon.$$

Then there is a critical point of φ which is strictly attracted to γ.

Proof. We essentially follow the proof of Lemma 4.1. In particular, we may assume that $\gamma = 0$, and that $U = D(0,1)$ is the largest disk containing 0 on which φ is injective. Setting V to be the connected component of $\varphi^{-1}(U)$ containing 0, we conclude that the mapping $\varphi : V \to U$ is everywhere m-to-1, for some integer $1 \le m \le d$. This time, however, we know that V is a disk $D(0,R)$, since φ is a polynomial, and that φ has exactly m zeros and no poles in $D(0,R)$, counting multiplicity.

Defining $G : \mathbb{H}_{\text{Berk}} \to \mathbb{R}$ exactly as in the proof of Lemma 4.1, then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} G(\zeta(0,R)) &\ge m \log |N_0^-(\varphi, \zeta(0,R), 0) - N_0^-(\varphi, \zeta(0,R), \infty)| \\ &= m \log m > |\varphi'(0)| = G(\zeta(0,1)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, there is some radius $S \in [1,R)$ at which $G(\zeta(0,r))$ begins to increase. We again conclude that inequality (12) holds. Because φ has no poles in $W = \overline{D}(0,S)$, it follows that

$$m[1 + N(\varphi', W, 0)] + (1-m)N(\varphi, W, 0) \ge 1.$$

Again setting $M \ge 0$ to be the number of critical points in W that are not zeros of φ, inequality (15) then implies

$$m(M-1) + N(\varphi, W, 0) \ge 1.$$

On the other hand, since $W \subseteq V$, we have $N(\varphi, W, 0) \le m$, and therefore $M \ge 1/m > 0$. That is, there is a critical point in W that is not a zero of φ, and the conclusion follows. □

Remark 5.2. In the proof of Theorem 5.1, the only use of the hypothesis that φ is a polynomial is to conclude that the connected affinoid V is in fact a disk $D(0,R)$, which in turn obviously implies that there are no poles inside $D(0,R)$. Thus, the sharper bound of Theorem 5.1 actually holds any time the region V in the proof of Lemma 4.1 is a disk, even when φ is a rational function.

The bound in Theorem 5.1 is sharp, as the following example shows.

Example 5.3. Let K, $|\cdot|$, p, and d be as in Theorem 1.2. Let m be an integer minimizing $|m|^m$ for $1 \le m \le d$. We will construct a PCF polynomial $\varphi(z) \in K[z]$ with a fixed point at $z = 0$ for which the multiplier satisfies $|\varphi'(0)| = |m|^m$. In particular, because φ is PCF, no critical points can be strictly attracted to the fixed point at 0.

If $|m| \ge |d|$, then by minimality we must have $m = d$. If $|d| = 1$, then

$$\varphi(z) = (z+1)^d - 1$$

has a fixed point at 0 of multiplier d, but being conjugate to $z \mapsto z^d$, φ is also PCF. On the other hand, if $|d| < 1$, then we may choose

$$\varphi(z) = \frac{d^d}{(1-d)^{d-1}}(z-1)^{d-1}z.$$

It is easy to check that each finite critical point ζ of φ satisfies $\varphi^2(\zeta) = 0$, and hence φ is PCF; in addition, $|\varphi'(0)| = |d|^d = |m|^m$, as desired.

It remains to consider the case that $|m| < |d| \le 1$. Define

$$\varphi(z) = az(z-1)^{m-1}(z-b)^{d-m} \in K[z],$$

where we will choose $a, b \in K$ shortly in order to guarantee that φ has no critical points other than 1, b, ∞, α, and β, for some $\alpha, \beta \in K$ satisfying

$$\varphi(\alpha) = 1, \quad \varphi(\beta) = b, \quad \text{and} \quad |ab^{d-m}| = |m|^m. \tag{16}$$

Conditions (16) imply that $|\varphi'(0)| = |m|^m$, but also that φ is a PCF map.

A simple computation shows that the only critical points of φ outside of 1, b, and ∞ are the two roots $\alpha, \beta \in K$ of the polynomial $dz^2 - (mb + d - m + 1)z + b$. Thus, to verify conditions (16), we need to show that there exist $a, b, \alpha, \beta \in K$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} &d\alpha\beta = b, && d(\alpha+\beta) = mb + d - m + 1, \\ &\varphi(\beta) = b\varphi(\alpha), && a = \alpha^{-1}(\alpha-1)^{-(m-1)}(\alpha-b)^{-(d-m)}, \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

and with $|ab^{d-m}| = |m|^m$. The first two equations of (17) give

$$\beta = \frac{d+1-m-d\alpha}{d(1-m\alpha)} \quad \text{and} \quad b = \frac{\alpha(d+1-m-d\alpha)}{1-m\alpha}, \tag{18}$$

which, when plugged into the third equation, gives $f(\alpha) = 0$, where

$$\begin{aligned} f(z) = d^d(d-m)^{d-m}z^{d-m+2}(z-1)^{d-1}(1-mz)^{m-1} \\ - (1-m)^{m-1}(1-dz)^{d-1}(d+1-m-dz)^{d-m}. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

It is easy to check that

$$|f(1/m)| = |d|^{2d-m-1}|m|^{m-2d+1} < |d|^{2d-m}|m|^{m-2d-1} = \|f\|_{\zeta(0,1/|m|)},$$

and hence f must have a root α in the open disk $D(1/m, 1/|m|)$. Equating the absolute values of the two terms in (19), we see that $|1-m\alpha|^{m-1} = |d|^{-1}|m|^2$. A short calculation then shows that the resulting values of $a, b, \beta \in K$ from equations (18) and the fourth equation of (17) satisfy $|ab^{d-m}| = |m|^m$. Thus, conditions (16) hold, and we have the desired PCF polynomial.

Even if φ is not a polynomial, the bound for $|\varphi'(\gamma)|$ in Lemma 4.1, and hence the constant $\varepsilon_{p,d}$ in Theorem 1.2, can be improved to

$$\varepsilon'_{p,d} = \min\left\{|m|^L|\ell|^{\ell-L} : 1 \le \ell \le n \le d \text{ and } 1 \le m \le n\right\},$$

where L is defined to be $\lceil (n-1)/2 \rceil$, and where $\lceil x \rceil$ denotes the smallest integer greater than or equal to x. However, the proof is a bit more complicated than the proof of Theorem 1.2. Moreover, the new constant $\varepsilon'_{p,d}$ is not a substantial improvement over $\varepsilon_{p,d}$, is far more complicated to write down, and appears still not to be quite sharp; see Example 5.4.

Rather than give a full proof of this stronger bound, then, we give only a sketch, as follows. With notation as in the proof of Lemma 4.1, note first that if the connected affinoid V is a disk, then Remark 5.2 shows that the bound $\varepsilon^{\text{poly}} \ge \varepsilon'_{p,d}$ suffices, and we are done. Thus, we may assume that V is not a disk. Define $1 \le n \le d$ to be the degree of the mapping $\varphi : V \to U$.

Let $R' \ge 1$ be the largest real number such that $D(0, R')$ contains no poles, and define $1 \le \ell \le n$ to be the degree of φ as a map from $D(0, R')$ to its image. Note that because V is not a disk, we must have $R' < R$. Defining $G_\ell : \mathbb{H}_{\text{Berk}} \to \mathbb{R}$ by $G_\ell(\zeta) = \ell\delta(\varphi, \zeta) + \log\|\varphi\|_\zeta$, we consider two cases. In the first case, if $G_\ell(\zeta(0, R')) > G_\ell(\zeta(0, 1))$, then we may mimic the proofs of Lemma 4.1 and Theorem 5.1 to obtain a critical point in $D(0, R')$ that is not a zero of φ.

In the second case, that $G_\ell(\zeta(0, R')) \le G_\ell(\zeta(0, 1)) = \log|\varphi'(0)|$, write $L = \lceil (n-1)/2 \rceil$ as above, and define $G_L(\zeta) = L\delta(\varphi, \zeta) + \log\|\varphi\|_\zeta$. Without loss, we may assume that $L \le \ell$; indeed, if $\ell < L$ in the definition of $\varepsilon'_{p,d}$ above, then since $2L \le n$, we may double ℓ until $\ell \ge L$. Thus, we have

$$G_L(\zeta(0, R')) = G_\ell(\zeta(0, R')) - (\ell - L)\delta(\varphi, \zeta(0, R')) \le \log|\varphi'(0)| - (\ell - L)\log|\ell|,$$

by Lemma 3.3. By the assumption $0 < |\varphi'(0)| < \varepsilon'_{p,d}$, it follows that $G_L(\zeta(0, R')) < L\log|m|$ for every integer $1 \le m \le n$.

Thus, G_L decreases at some point along each line segement in $\mathbb{H}_{\text{Berk}}$ from $\zeta(0, R')$ to a boundary point $\zeta(b_i, r_i)$ or $\zeta(0, R)$ of V. We may therefore define a connected affinoid $W' \subseteq V$ just as we constructed W in the proof of Lemma 4.1; and because $D(0, R')$ was already the largest disk containing 0 but no poles of φ, W' cannot be a disk. That is, W' is a disk with a *positive* number $k \geq 1$ of smaller disks removed. Mimicking the proof of Lemma 4.1 from inequality (12) onward, then, for G_L instead of G, we ultimately deduce that

$$LM > (1+k)(1+L) - n \geq 2(1+L) - n \geq (n+1) - n > 0,$$

where M is the number of critical points in W' that are not zeros of φ, and we are done.

It is unclear, however, what the sharp bound is for the general case of rational functions. Example 5.4 below shows that for any integers $1 \leq m \leq d$ with $|m| < |d| < 1$, there are PCF maps φ of degree d and with an attracting fixed point γ with $|\varphi'(\gamma)| = |d|^{d-m/2}|m|^{m/2}$. Although this multiplier does not attain the bound of $\varepsilon'_{p,d}$ above, it is in general strictly smaller than the polynomial bound of $\varepsilon^{\text{poly}}_{p,d}$. For example, if $K = \mathbb{C}_p$ and $d = p^e + p^{e-1}$ for some positive integer e, then $\varepsilon^{\text{poly}}_{p,d} = |p|^v$, where $v = p^{e-1}\max\{ep, (e-1)(p+1)\}$. Meanwhile, the choice of $m = p^e < d$ gives $|d|^{d-m/2}|m|^{m/2} = |p|^w$, where $w = p^{e-1}(2ep - p + 2e - 2)/2$. If $e > 1 + p/2$, then $|p|^w < |p|^v$.

Example 5.4. Let K, $|\cdot|$, p, and d be as in Theorem 1.2, let $1 \leq m \leq d$ be another integer, and assume that $|m| < |d| < 1$. Define

$$\varphi(z) = \frac{az(z-1)^{d-1}}{(z-b)^{d-m}} \in K(z)$$

for some $a, b \in K$ to be chosen shortly. The only critical points of φ other than 1, b, and ∞ are the two roots $\alpha, \beta \in K$ of

$$mz^2 - (db - d + m + 1)z + b.$$

If we declare that $\alpha = \beta \neq 0$, it follows quickly that $b = m\alpha^2$, and then that α satisfies

$$md\alpha^2 - 2m\alpha - d + m + 1 = 0.$$

The Newton polygon of this equation indicates that such an $\alpha \in K$ exists with $|\alpha| = |md|^{-1/2}$. Choosing $b = m\alpha^2$ and $a = \alpha^{-1}(\alpha-1)^{1-d}(\alpha-b)^{d-m}$, where the latter choice guarantees that $\varphi(\alpha) = 1$ and hence that φ is PCF, we have $|b| = |d|^{-1}$ and $|a| = |md|^{-m/2}$. Thus, the multiplier of the fixed point at 0 has absolute value $|\varphi'(0)| = |d|^{d-m/2}|m|^{m/2}$, as claimed.

6. Periodic Points

As noted in the introduction, we would like to remove the dependence on n of the bound ε_{p,d^n} in order to prove Theorem 1.5. The following lemma allows us to achieve this goal, at least in the situation when $\varepsilon_{p,d} = 1$.

Lemma 6.1. *Let p and K be as in Theorem 1.2, and suppose that $\varphi(z) \in K(z)$ can be written as a composition of rational functions, each of degree less than p. Then $|\deg_{\zeta,\vec{v}}(\varphi)| = 1$ for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{P}^1_{\mathrm{Berk}}$ and all directions $\vec{v}$ at ζ.*

Proof. Write $\varphi = \psi_j \circ \cdots \circ \psi_1$, where $d_i = \deg \psi_i \leq p - 1$. Given any $\zeta \in \mathbb{P}^1_{\mathrm{Berk}}$ and direction $\vec{v}$ at ζ, write $\xi_1 = \zeta$ and $\vec{w}_1 = \vec{v}$; then set $\xi_i = \psi_i(\xi_{i-1})$ and $\vec{w}_i = \psi_{i,*}(\vec{w}_{i-1})$ for all $i = 2, \ldots, j$. Then

$$\deg_{\zeta,\vec{v}}(\varphi) = \prod_{i=1}^{j} \deg_{\xi_i,\vec{w}_i}(\psi_i)$$

by Lemma 3.1. However, each integer $\deg_{\xi_i,\vec{w}_i}(\psi_i)$ lies between 1 and $d_i \leq p - 1$. Hence,

$$|\deg_{\zeta,\vec{v}}(\varphi)| = \prod_{i=1}^{j} |\deg_{\xi_i,\vec{w}_i}(\psi_i)| = 1^j = 1 \qquad \square$$

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Let γ be a periodic point of φ of period n and multiplier λ, with $0 < |\lambda| < 1$. Then γ is an attracting fixed point for φ^n. By Lemma 6.1, we have $|\deg_{\zeta,\vec{v}}(\varphi^n)| = 1$ for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{P}^1_{\mathrm{Berk}}$ and directions $\vec{v}$. Therefore, applying Lemma 4.1 to φ^n, which is a rational function of degree d^n, γ strictly attracts a critical point of φ^n, under the iteration of φ^n. However, by the chain rule, critical points of φ^n are precisely points $x \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$ for which at least one of $x, \varphi(x), ..., \varphi^{n-1}(x)$ is a critical point of φ. It follows that γ strictly attracts a critical point of φ under the iteration of φ^n, and hence that the periodic cycle of γ strictly attracts a critical point of φ under the iteration of φ. $\square$

Corollary 1.6 follows immediately from Theorem 1.5, because under those hypotheses, there is a distinct critical point associated to each attracting cycle. The bound of $2d - 2$ is simply the number of critical points of a rational function $\varphi \in K(z)$ of degree d. It is worth noting that, just as in the complex case, this result bounds the number of attracting *cycles*, not the number of points in those cycles.

Proof of Corollary 1.7. Suppose one periodic cycle's multiplier does not lie in an algebraic extension of the prime field. If the field is a global function field of dimension 1, then this is equivalent to the multiplier being a non-constant function, and hence in some valuation the cycle is attracting but not superattracting. Replacing K by the algebraic closure of its completion with respect to this valuation, we may apply Theorem 1.5 to obtain that the cycle in question strictly attracts a critical point. Therefore φ is not PCF.

For a function field of arbitrary dimension, note that the PCF locus in $\mathcal{M}_d$ is defined over an algebraic extension of a finite field, and therefore over a finite field. Thus, any two points on the same connected component can be joined by an algebraic curve defined over a finite field. This is a PCF curve over a finite field, and hence it defines a PCF map over a one-dimensional global function field. Its multipliers therefore lie in the algebraic closure of the prime field, and the same applies to the connected component. □

Remark 6.2. Although the set of all multipliers of a PCF map in characteristic 0 or $p > d$ only has to lie in an algebraic extension of the prime subfield, the multiplier *spectra* have to also lie in the field of definition of the map. Since the map is always defined over a finite-type extension, generated by its coefficients, the multiplier spectra have to lie in a finite extension of the prime subfield, which depends on the map but does not depend on the period of the spectrum.

Unfortunately, Corollary 1.7 does not provide a proof of Thurston's rigidity result for a global function field K of characteristic $p > d$. However, if we had an analogue of McMullen's theorem in positive characteristic, then Corollary 1.7 would imply that any PCF map in $K(x)$ of degree d must have constant multipliers, and hence must be either Lattès or isotrivial. *A priori*, however, there might be other exceptional varieties for the multiplier spectrum maps over fields of characteristic p. Fortunately, in one case we have a McMullen-type result independent of characteristic, giving us rigidity.

Corollary 6.3. *Suppose that K is a global function field of characteristic 0 or $p \geq 3$. Then any quadratic PCF map over K is isotrivial, and thus defined over a finite extension of the prime field (i.e. a number field in characteristic 0 and a finite field in characteristic $p \geq 3$) after an appropriate change of coordinates.*

Proof. By results of Silverman [43], extending earlier work of Milnor [34], the map $\Lambda_1 : \mathcal{M}_2 \to \mathbb{A}^3$ defines an isomorphism over $\mathbb{Z}$ between $\mathcal{M}_2$ and a plane. Since the image of any PCF map under Λ_1 will be defined over an algebraic extension of the prime field, so is the corresponding point in $\mathcal{M}_2(K)$ by Corollary 1.7. Finally, by Remark 6.2, the map in fact is defined over a finite extension of the prime field. □

Although Theorems 1.2 and 1.5 apply to function fields of characteristic 0 or $p > d$, Theorem 1.2 completely fails for a function field of characteristic $p \leq d$, since the bound $|\deg_{\zeta,\vec{v}}(\varphi)| \leq \delta(\varphi, \zeta)$ from Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3 is vacuous if $\operatorname{char} K | \deg_{\zeta,\vec{v}}(\varphi)$. Indeed, Corollary 6.3 is false for a function field of characteristic p, because the family $z^p + tz$ is PCF. It is thus not surprising that Theorem 1.2 fails as well; the map $z^p + t^n z$ is PCF, with a fixed point at $z = 0$ of multiplier t^n, and we can make the t-adic absolute value of t^n arbitrarily small just by increasing n.

7. Good reduction

It follows from Theorem 1.5 that if $\varphi(z) \in K(z)$ is a PCF map of degree $d \geq 2$, and if the residue characteristic of K is 0 or $p > d$, then φ has no periodic cycles that are attracting but not superattracting. Example 1 shows that such a map φ may have repelling cycles. However, the following result shows that if φ is a polynomial, then it also has no repelling cycles.

Theorem 7.1. *Let p and K be as in Theorem 1.2, let $\varphi \in K[z]$ be a PCF polynomial of degree $d \geq 2$, and suppose either that $p = 0$ or that φ can be written as a composition of polynomials of degree less than p. Then φ has potentially good reduction, and in particular it has no repelling cycles.*

Proof. Suppose φ does not have potentially good reduction. After a change of coordinates, we may assume that 0 is a fixed point of φ and that φ is monic. Hence, we may write $\varphi(z) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} a_i z^i$, with $a_d = 1$. By our supposition, φ does not have good reduction in this coordinate, and hence $|a_i| > 1$ for some $1 \leq i < d$. As a result, φ has a zero of some maximum absolute value $r > 1$.

By Lemma 6.1, the tangent direction multiplicities of φ at every Berkovich point are never divisible by p, and hence for any $s > 0$, the Weierstrass degree of φ on $D(0, s)$ is never divisible by p. Thus, because this same Weierstrass degree is the smallest integer $n \geq 1$ for which $|a_n|s^n$ attains its maximum value, it follows that n is also the smallest integer for which $|na_n|s^{n-1}$ attains its maximum value. In other words, the Newton polygon of φ' is exactly the Newton polygon of φ, but shifted to the left by one unit. In particular, φ and φ' have the same number of zeros (counting multiplicity) of absolute value r.

For any zero α of φ with $|\alpha| = r$, consider the polynomial $\psi(z) = \varphi(z+\alpha)$. Because $\psi(0) = 0$ but the tangent multiplicities of ψ are prime to p, the same argument as in the previous paragraph shows that the Newton polygon of ψ' is simply that of ψ shifted one unit to the left, and hence ψ' has one fewer zero in $D(0, r)$ than ψ does. That is, φ has one fewer critical point in $D(\alpha, r)$ than it has zeros.

Combining the conclusions of the previous two paragraphs, then, it follows from the pigeonhole principle that there is some critical point β of φ such that $|\beta| = r$, but φ has no zeros in $D(\beta, r)$. It follows by induction on $m \geq 1$, then, that

$$|\varphi^m(\beta)| = \prod_{i=1}^{d} |\varphi^{m-1}(\beta) - \alpha_i| = r^{d^m},$$

where $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d$ are the zeros of φ. Since $r > 1$, we see that the critical point β is strictly attracted to ∞, and hence φ is not PCF. $\square$

Remark 7.2. Theorem 7.1 can be easily extended to any PCF polynomial $\varphi \in K[z]$ of degree $d \geq 2$ for which every Berkovich tangent multiplicity $m = \deg_{\zeta,\vec{v}}(\varphi)$ satisfies either $|m| = 1$, $|m| > |d|$, or $m = d$. After all, under those weaker hypotheses, if the Newton polygon of φ' is not simply a shift of the Newton polygon of φ, then φ has a critical point β of absolute value *strictly* larger than the maximum absolute value r

of the roots of φ. Thus, if φ had bad reduction, and hence $r > 0$, β would again be strictly attracted to ∞.

In particular, if K is a p-adic field, then Theorem 7.1 applies to polynomials of p-power degree. This observation reinterprets a result of Epstein [17], who uses it to prove Thurston's rigidity using algebraic methods in the case of polynomials of prime-power degree. Unfortunately, one cannot combine the p-power result with Theorem 7.1 to prove an analogous theorem for, say, polynomials of degree $p^e m$, where $m < p$. Indeed, there are counterexamples to Epstein's statement in cases where $p|d$ but d is not a power of p.

Remark 7.3. The proofs of Theorems 1.2 and 7.1 and Lemma 6.1 show that the failure of an (insufficiently) attracting periodic point to strictly attract a critical point, and the failure of bad reduction for a polynomial to force the point at infinity to strictly attract a critical point, can only occur in the presence of wild ramification. Indeed, such pathological dynamics can only arise when a tangent direction $\vec{v}$ at a Berkovich point ζ has multiplicity $\deg_{\zeta,\vec{v}}(\varphi)$ divisible by p. Without loss, we may assume that ζ is of type II, and after (possibly different) coordinate changes on the domain and range, we may assume that $\zeta = \varphi(\zeta) = \zeta(0,1)$. In those coordinates, having a tangent multiplicity divisible by p corresponds to wild ramification of the reduced map $\overline{\varphi} \in k(z)$ over $\mathbb{P}^1(k)$, where k denotes the residue field. In this light, Lemma 6.1 shows simply that a composition of maps of degree less than the residue characteristic can never be wildly ramified. Thus, the important property of low-degree maps is not so much the fact that the degree is small, but rather that such maps are absolutely tamely ramified, in the sense that they exhibit only tame ramification over the residue field in any choice of coordinates.

Acknowledgements The first author gratefully acknowledges the support of NSF grants DMS-0901494 and DMS-1201341. The second author gratefully acknowledges the support of NSERC of Canada during some of this project. The third author gratefully acknowledges the support of NSF grant DMS-0852826.

REFERENCES

[1] W. Aitken, F. Hajir, and C. Maire, Finitely ramified iterated extensions, *Int. Math. Res. Not.* **14** (2005), pp. 855–880.

[2] T. M. Apostol, *Introduction to Analytic Number Theory*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1976.

[3] M. Baker and R. Rumely, *Potential Theory and Dynamics on the Berkovich Projective Line*, American Mathematical Society, 2010.

[4] A. Beardon, Iteration of rational functions, 1st ed., Springer-Verlag Graduate Texts in Mathematics 132, 1991.

[5] R. Benedetto, Fatou Components in p-adic Dynamics, Ph.D. thesis, Brown University, 1998.

[6] R. Benedetto, An Ahlfors islands theorem for non-archimedean meromorphic functions, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **360(8)** (2008), pp. 4099–4124.

[7] V. Berkovich, *Spectral Theory and Analytic Geometry over Non-archimedean Fields*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1990.

[8] B. Bielefeld, Y. Fisher, and J. Hubbard, The classification of critically preperiodic polynomials as dynamical systems, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **5(4)** (1992), pp. 721–762.

[9] S. Bosch, U. Güntzer, and R. Remmert, *Non-Archimedean Analysis: A Systematic Approach to Rigid Analytic Geometry,* Springer-Verlag Berlin, Heidelberg 1984.

[10] N. Boston and R. Jones, The image of an arboreal Galois representation, *Pure and Applied Mathematics Quarterly* **5** (2009), pp. 213–225.

[11] E. Brezin, R. Byrne, J. Levy, K. Pilgrim, and K. Plummer, A census of rational maps, *Conformal Geometry and Dynamics* **4** (2000), pp. 35–74.

[12] X. Buff, A. Epstein, S. Koch, and K. Pilgrim, On Thurston's pullback map, (2011 preprint; arXiv:1105.1763).

[13] J. W. Cannon, W. J. Floyd, W. R. Parry, and K. M. Pilgrim, Nearly Euclidean Thurston maps, (2012 preprint; arXiv:1204.3615)

[14] B. Conrad, Several approaches to non-Archimedean geometry, in *p-adic Geometry*, Univ. Lecture Ser., **45**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 2008, pp. 963.

[15] A. Douady and J. Hubbard, A proof of Thurston's topological characterization of rational functions, *Acta Math.* **171** (1993), pp. 263–297.

[16] A. Epstein, Infinitesimal Thurston rigidity and the Fatou-Shishikura inequality (1999 preprint; arXiv:math/9902158).

[17] A. Epstein, Integrality and rigidity for postcritically finite polynomials, (2010 preprint; arXiv:1010.2780).

[18] X. Faber, Topology and geometry of the Berkovich ramification locus for rational functions, II, (2011 preprint; arXiv:1104.0943v2).

[19] P. Fatou, Sur les équations fonctionelles, *Bull. de la S. M. F.* **47** (1919), pp. 161–271.

[20] P. Fatou, Sur les équations fonctionelles, *Bull. de la S. M. F.* **48** (1920), pp. 208–314.

[21] J. Fresnel and M. van der Put, *Rigid analytic geometry and its applications*, Birkhäuser, Boston, MA, 2004.

[22] C. Favre and J. Rivera-Letelier, Théorie ergodique des fractions rationelles sur un corps ultramétrique, *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.* **100** (2010), 116–154.

[23] D. Goldfeld, The class number of quadratic fields and the conjectures of Birch and Swinnerton-Dyer, *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci.* (4) **3** (1976), pp. 624–663.

[24] D. Goldfeld, Gauss' class number problem for imaginary quadratic fields, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **13** (1985), pp. 23–37.

[25] B. Gross and D. B. Zagier, Heegner points and derivatives of L-series, *Invent. Math.* **84** (1986), pp. 225–320.

[26] P. Haïssinsky and K. Pilgrim, An algebraic characterization of expanding Thurston maps (2012 preprint; arXiv:1204.3214)

[27] B. Hutz and M. Tepper, Multiplier spectra and the moduli space of degree 3 morphisms on $\mathbb{P}^1$, (2011 preprint; arXiv:1110.5082).

[28] P. Ingram, A finiteness result for post-critically finite polynomials, to appear in *Int. Math. Res. Not.* (doi:10.1093/imrn/rnr030).

[29] G. Julia, Mémoire sur l'iteration des fonctions rationelles, *J. Math. P. at Appl.* **8** (1918), pp. 47–245.

[30] N. Koblitz, *p-adic Numbers, p-adic Analysis, and Zeta-Functions*, 2nd ed., volume 58 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1984.

[31] S. Koch, Teichmüller theory and critically finite endomorphisms, (2011 preprint; `http://www.math.harvard.edu/~kochs/endo.pdf`).

[32] A. Levy, The space of morphisms on projective space, *Acta Arith.* **146** (2011), pp. 13–31.

[33] C. McMullen, Families of rational maps and iterative root-finding algorithms, *Ann. of Math.* **125** (1987), pp. 467–493.

[34] J. Milnor, Geometry and dynamics of quadratic rational maps, *Experiment. Math.* **2** (1993), pp. 37–83.

[35] D. G. Northcott, An Inequality in the theory of arithmetic on algebraic varieties, *Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc.*, **45** (1949), pp. 502–509 and pp. 510–518.

[36] C. Petsche, L. Szpiro, and M. Tepper, Isotriviality is equivalent to potential good reduction for endomorphisms of $\mathbb{P}^N$ over function fields, *Journal of Algebra* **322**, (2009), pp. 3345–3365.

[37] J. Rivera-Letelier, Dynamique des fonctions rationnelles sur des corps locaux, *Astérisque* No. 287 (2003), xv, pp. 147–230.

[38] P. Robba, Fonctions analytiques sur les corps valués ultramétriques complets, *Astérisque* **10** (1973), pp. 109–218.

[39] A. Robert, *A Course in p-adic Analysis*, volume 198 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000.

[40] F. Rong, The Fatou set for critically finite maps, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **136** (2008), pp. 3621–3625.

[41] M. Shishikura, On the quasiconformal surgery of rational functions, *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.* **20** (1987), pp. 1–29.

[42] J. H. Silverman, *The Arithmetic of Dynamical Systems*, volume 241 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2007.

[43] J. H. Silverman, The space of rational maps on $\mathbb{P}^1$, *Duke Math. J.* **94** (1998), pp. 41–77.

Department of Mathematics, Amherst College, Amherst, MA

Department of Mathematics, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO

Department of Mathematics, Carleton College, Northfield, MN

Department of Mathematics, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada